



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/664,283

09/17/2003

Jodi Breslin

72167.000460

4534

21967 7590 10/21/2008

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
1900 K STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 1200  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

MANSFIELD, THOMAS L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/21/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/664,283	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BRESLIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> THOMAS MANSFIELD	<b>Art Unit</b> 3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This non-final Office action is in reply to the response to Office Action filed on 7 July 2008.
2. No claims have been amended.
3. Claims 1-30 are currently pending and have been examined.
4. This office action has been made non-final in order to address a new grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
6. Applicant submits that Callahan (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0229525) does not teach or suggest in Claim 1: (1) *assessing an impact on the enterprise from a degradation of the services from the outside service provider* [see Remarks page 11, first paragraph], and (2) *automatically determining a criticality of the outside service provider in response to the assessment* [see Remarks page 11, first paragraph].
7. Applicant submits that Callahan in view of Bott (U.S. 6,856,973) does not teach or suggest in Claim 2: (3) *identifying countries in which the outside service provider operates, and determining a country impact risk associated with the countries, wherein the step of automatically determining the criticality is also in response to the country impact risk* [see Remarks page 13, first paragraph].
8. With regard to argument (1), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Callahan teaches *assessing an impact (impact value) on the enterprise from a degradation (perceivable threats, damage that could occur, insufficient to ensure compliance in an area represented by the question) of the services from the outside service provider* (Third Party Service Provider, the impact is less critical

Art Unit: 3624

than if account balances, account numbers, and transactions were revealed) (see at least paragraphs 0025-0028 and 0060).

9. With regard to argument (2), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Callahan teaches *automatically determining a criticality of the outside service provider in response to the assessment* the impact is less critical than if account balances, account numbers, and transactions were revealed, (overall risk rating, assessment) (see at least paragraphs 0060 and 0069-0071).
10. With regard to argument (3), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Callahan in view of Bott teaches, *identifying countries in which the outside service provider operates and determining a country impact risk* (country risk assessment system, volatility risk) *associated with the countries, wherein the step of automatically determining the criticality is also in response to the country impact risk* (drastic action is required, drastic measures) (see at least column 7, line 39 through column 8, line 22 and Figure 4).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

11. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
12. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
13. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S.

175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. Here, applicant's method steps, fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they are not tied to another statutory class and can be preformed without the use of a particular apparatus. Thus, claims 1-18 are non-statutory since they may be performed within the human mind.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

- 14.** The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- 15.** Claims 1, 4-11, 15-19, 21-25, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Callahan et al (Callahan) (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0229525).

With regard to Claim 1, Callahan teaches a method and system comprising:

Art Unit: 3624

- *identifying outside service provider information that describes the outside service provider* (provide a population of all third-party providers and risk-rank them) (see at least paragraph 0028).
- *storing the outside service provider information in a database* (Assessment templates, 612, are also stored in fixed storage) (see at least paragraph 0043).
- *identifying resource information that describes resources of the enterprise associated with services provided by the outside service provider* (the type of data shared between the financial services company and the provider) (see at least paragraph 0028).
- *storing the resource information in the database* (Assessment templates, 612, are also stored in fixed storage) (see at least paragraph 0043).
- *assessing an impact* (impact value) *on the enterprise from a degradation* (perceivable threats, damage that could occur, insufficient to ensure compliance in an area represented by the question) *of the services from the outside service provider* (Third Party Service Provider, the impact is less critical than if account balances, account numbers, and transactions were revealed) (see at least paragraphs 0025-0028 and 0060).
- *storing the assessment in the database* (Assessment templates, 612, are also stored in fixed storage) (see at least paragraph 0043).
- *automatically determining a criticality of the outside service provider in response to the assessment* the impact is less critical than if account balances, account numbers, and transactions were revealed, (overall risk rating, assessment) (see at least paragraphs 0060 and 0069-0071).

Art Unit: 3624

- *storing the criticality in the database* (Assessment templates, 612, are also stored in fixed storage) (see at least paragraph 0043).
- *providing status data from the database* (SQL database) (see at least paragraph 0055), *wherein the status data comprises at least **one** of a status of:*
  - *the resource information*
  - *the assessment* (updated to change the status of the assessment) (see at least paragraph 0055).
  - *the criticality* (critical) (see at least paragraph 0060).

With regard to Claim 19, Callahan teaches a system, interface, database server, and application server (Microsoft's Internet Information Services) (see at least paragraph 0047). Claim 19 is further substantially similar to claim 1 and is rejected for the same rationale as set forth above.

With regard to Claims 4 and 21, Callahan teaches *wherein at least one of the resources of the enterprise includes at least one software application employed by the enterprise* (Application Software) (see at least paragraph 0029).

With regard to Claims 5 and 22, Callahan teaches: *wherein the step of assessing the impact* (threat value, impact value) *on the enterprise further comprises at least **one of**:*

- *assessing an impact on external customers* (customer's name) (see at least paragraph 0060) *of the enterprise resulting from the degradation of the services from the outside service provider.*
- *assessing an impact on internal customers* (of other areas of the enterprise) (see at least paragraph 0025) *of the enterprise resulting from the degradation of the services from the outside service provider.*

- *assessing a financial impact* (account balances, account numbers, and transactions) *resulting from the degradation of the services from the outside service provider* (see at least paragraph 0060).
- *assessing an allowable time period that the degradation of the services from the outside service provider can last.*
- *assessing an impact on regulatory obligations* (monitoring compliance with the GLBA [Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA), paragraph 0002]) *resulting from the degradation of the services from the outside service provider* (see at least paragraph 0020).

With regard to Claims 6 and 23, Callahan teaches *assigning specific people* (data guardian) *to fulfill roles with respect to management of a relationship with the outside service provider, wherein the roles include at least one of information owner and information risk manager* (see at least paragraph 0034).

With regard to Claims 7 and 24, Callahan teaches *receiving acknowledgements of the acceptances of the assignments from the specific people* (obtains a sign-off from the approver) (see at least paragraph 0034).

With regard to Claims 8 and 25, Callahan teaches *assigning alternate people to fulfill the roles* (one or more re-viewers or “data guardians”) (see at least paragraph 0026).

With regard to Claim 9, Callahan teaches *wherein the role of the information owner comprises at least **one of**:*

- *obtaining from the outside service provider copies of financial and non-financial audit reports* (audits) (see at least paragraph 0024).



Art Unit: 3624

- *obtaining documentation describing the outside service provider's procedural, physical access, logical access and business recovery controls (emphasizing those that have access to or who manipulate, store, transmit or destroy the company's consumer customer information) (see at least paragraph 0028).*
- *requiring notification by the outside service provider of any organization, security-related and other changes affecting the availability, confidentiality, or integrity of the services provided by the outside service provider.*
- *initiating the risk assessment process (The process starts at 201) (see at least paragraph 0026).*

With regard to Claim 10, Callahan teaches *wherein the role of information risk manager (data guardian) comprises at least **one of**:*

- *maintaining an updated list of outside service providers used by the enterprise (the database is kept updated) (see at least paragraphs 0054-0056).*
- *allocating resources for the outside service provider assessment process.*

With regard to Claims 11 and 30, Callahan teaches *wherein all of the steps of the method are facilitated using a software application (risk assessment module), the method further comprising:*

- *generating data input screens for accepting input from a user (screens that show detail of how comments are entered and risk values are established) (see at least paragraph 0059).*
- *providing drop down boxes on the data input screens in order to facilitate selection of predefined information (a drop-down box, accessed from the tab, displays that progress) (see at least paragraph 0058).*

With regard to Claims 15 and 29, teaches *providing status data on the enterprise level; providing status data on a line of business level; and providing status data on a department level* (handle assessments at whatever level a business unit or the enterprise wants, executives, administrators, senior managers) (see at least paragraph 0032).

With regard to Claim 16, Callahan teaches *wherein the enterprise has policies and procedures* (policies and procedures) *for protecting the integrity of the provision of services* (Identify perceivable threats, evaluate the likelihood of those threats), *the method further comprising assessing the compliance* (compliance) *of the outside service provider to the policies and procedures* (see at least paragraph 0025).

With regard to Claim 17, Callahan teaches *developing a corrective action plan if the outside service provider is not in compliance, the corrective action plan containing the steps required to bring the outside service provider into compliance* (The assessor works through whatever corrective action needs to be taken on the assessment and re-submits it to the data guardian) (see at least paragraph 0057).

With regard to Claim 18, Callahan teaches *obtaining an acknowledgement by management of the enterprise of risk associated with the non-compliance of the outside service provider* (non-compliance is indicated based on a response or group of responses) (see at least paragraph 0023).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3624

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 2, 3, 12-14, 20, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callahan as applied to claims 1, 4-11, 15-19, 21-25, 29, and 30 above, in view of Bott (U.S. 6,856,973) and in further view of Borgia et al (Borgia) (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0129221).

With regard to Claims 2 and 20, Callahan does not specifically teach *identifying countries in which the outside service provider operates and determining a country impact risk associated with the countries, wherein the step of automatically determining the criticality is also in response to the country impact risk*. Bott teaches *identifying countries in which the outside service provider operates and determining a country impact risk* (country risk assessment system, volatility risk) *associated with the countries, wherein the step of automatically determining the criticality is also in response to the country impact risk* (drastic action is required, drastic measures) in analogous art of assessing creditworthiness of a country for the purposes of, "[u]nits of government could use their legal empowerment to delay or discontinue transactions" (see at least column 7, line 39 through column 8, line 22 and Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the volatility risk of that country as taught by Bott with the integrated compliance monitoring method of Callahan. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of knowing an updated status of a country's ability to maintain a strong economic status (Bott, column 8, lines 10-22).

With regard to Claim 3, Callahan does not specifically teach *collecting economic condition information with respect to the country; storing the economic condition information in the*

Art Unit: 3624

*database; collecting social condition information with respect to the country; storing the social condition information in the database; collecting political condition information with respect to the country; add storing the political condition information in the database. Bott teaches collecting economic (economic) condition information with respect to the country; storing the economic condition information in the database (creating a database of economic scores for the country) (see at least column 1, lines 36-45); collecting social condition (social) information with respect to the country; storing the social condition information in the database; collecting political condition information with respect to the country; add storing the political condition (political) (see at least column 4, lines 64-67 and column 5, lines 1-7) information in the database in analogous art of assessing creditworthiness of a country for the purposes of, "[f]actors that may interfere with an ability or willingness of a country and its economic agents to honor their financial or contractual obligations to non-resident owners...)" (see at least column 5, lines 2-7).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the economic and risk factors of a country as taught by Bott with the integrated compliance monitoring method of Callahan. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of implementing a country risk assessment system (Bott, column 4, lines 64-67).

With regard to Claims 12 and 26, Callahan and Bott do not teach *assessing a recovery plan of the outside service provider*. Borgia teaches *assessing a recovery plan* (plan accessible to a crisis team for recovery) *of the outside service provider* (see at least paragraph 0043) in analogous art of tracking compliance with policies related to management of risk for the purposes of "...an information policy provides the requirements for disaster recover preparedness" (see at least paragraph 0043).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the disaster recover preparedness plan as taught by Borgia with the economic and risk factors of a country as taught by Bott and the integrated compliance monitoring method of

Callahan. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of un-interrupted business process due to a backup recovery plan (Borgia, paragraph 0043).

With regard to Claims 13 and 27, Callahan and Bott do not teach *questioning the developer of the plan as to whether it has required elements; and developing a corrective action plan to address missing required elements*. Borgia teaches *questioning the developer* (risk management assessor) *of the plan as to whether it has required elements* (consisting of a series of questions that must be answered with appropriate responses to product compliance) *and developing a corrective action plan to address missing required elements* (reviews areas of non-compliance and the associated risk acknowledgements to provide approval if appropriate) in analogous art of tracking compliance with policies related to management of risk for the purposes of “having an approved process or plan in place to achieve compliance” (see at least paragraphs 0043-0057).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the disaster recover preparedness plan as taught by Borgia with the economic and risk factors of a country as taught by Bott and the integrated compliance monitoring method of Callahan. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of increased awareness and corrective measures for missing elements or non-compliance with a business institution (Borgia, paragraphs 0043-0057).

With regard to Claims 14 and 28, Callahan and Bott do not teach *an alternate site for providing the services; and a business continuity plan for resumption of the services at the alternate site*. Borgia teaches *an alternate site for providing the services* (may depend upon such factors as whether information is stored off site on a regular basis) *and a business continuity plan for resumption of the services at the alternate site* (Once risk is acknowledged, a plan for reducing the risk or bringing the project into compliance can be formulated) in analogous art of tracking compliance with policies related to management of risk for the purposes of “The rating for

Art Unit: 3624

disaster recovery readiness may depend upon such factors as whether information is stored off site on a regular basis, intervals in which system backups are made, robustness of computer recovery systems (see at least paragraph 0017).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the disaster recover preparedness plan as taught by Borgia with the economic and risk factors of a country as taught by Bott and the integrated compliance monitoring method of Callahan. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of survivability due to a disaster by having an alternate backup (Borgia, paragraph 0017).

### ***Conclusion***

**18.** The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Gopinathan et al (U.S. 6,330,546) discloses risk determination and management using predictive modeling and transaction profiles for individual transaction entities.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS MANSFIELD whose telephone number is (571)270-1904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30 am-6 pm, alt. Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bradley Bayat can be reached on 571-272-6704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative

Application/Control Number: 10/664,283

Page 14

Art Unit: 3624

or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. M./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3624

10 October 2008  
Thomas Mansfield

/Bradley B Bayat/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623